

LibertyColumns.com Library

Volume I
(2009-2011)

Daniel R. Quintiliani

LibertyColumns.com Library: Volume I (2009-2011)

by Daniel R. Quintiliani

Completed July 8, 2012

Dedicated to the public domain according to the Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication on July 8, 2012

CONTENTS

- Preface / *pg. 4*
- “Kenyan-born Obama”: Will they pull a WTC7 or a Philander Knox? / *pg. 6*
- "Blogs vs. Twitter & Facebook" Arguments, As Applied to the Bill of Rights / *pg 7*
- Thoughts on funding of “cures” for psychiatric illnesses / *pg 11*
- Repealing The 17th Amendment: Dealing With Politicians And Special Interests / *pg 13*
- Maybe I should say it on my own blog instead of repeating the same stuff everywhere else over and over again. / *pg 15*
- The main problem with conservatism and the Republican Party / *pg 16*
- It is obvious... / *pg 18*
- How To Discover Media Bias / *pg 19*
- Ayn Rand Isn’t Libertarianism, She Destroys It / *pg 22*
- The Seven Deadly Dogmas of Public Life / *pg 24*
- The End of the Internet / *pg 26*
- Obama’s Clones and the Split Tea Party Movement: Thoughts On The Straw Poll / *pg 28*
- Didn’t Talk Radio Teach You Anything? Republicans, Wake Up! / *pg 30*
- Thoughts on Ron Paul’s statements at Monday’s Tea Party debate regarding terrorism / *pg 32*
- Copyleft Risks – An Answer from RMS / *pg 34*
- Pro-Choice Herman Cain is a Fiscal Liberal Too: The Proof is Extremely Obvious / *pg 36*
- The Legacy of Obamacare: The Death of the Small Business / *pg 37*
- Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication / *pg 39*

PREFACE

Since 2009 I have run a blog known as the X-Cop Fly Company (www.xcopfly.com) which has varied in its nature over the years. I was never able to decide what I wanted it to be – the site had been a personal journal, political commentary, personal photos, and humorous videos at various times.

However, over time people were noticing my political columns, and some of my columns were reproduced at Brian Duffy's Repeal the 17th Amendment blog (<http://repealthe17thamendment.blogspot.com>), with myself being interviewed on several episodes of his podcast, and eventually my site was listed at Librabase (www.librabase.com), a blog aggregator with a rating system similar to Digg's.

It became apparent that I needed a separate blog devoted to conservative and libertarian political commentary. LibertyColumns.com (www.libertycolumns.com) was created in June 2012, with several columns from the X-Cop Fly Company re-posted there.

As with X-Cop Fly Company, I opted to waive all rights on most of the self-written material, choosing Creative Commons' CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication, while retaining the copyright on a few things (and, of course, avoiding violating others' copyrights)

One of the things I do with X-Cop Fly Company is a series of eBooks known as *The Fly Papers*. These eBooks, separated into volumes, contain all posts (usually 6 months' worth per volume) with copyrighted content stripped, and the eBooks are themselves waived under the Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication. This is being done for several reasons, most notably the lack of public domain material in the face of popular copyleft and no-commercial-use licensing. Completely waiving the material would encourage historical preservation, increase financial opportunities for all who would make use of it, discourage anti-American multiculturalism, and discourage the restrictive nature of copyright, which is increasingly being viewed as a super-property right with infinitely-expanding terms.

In order to legally waive the rights on *The Fly Papers*, copyrighted content (such as quotes from news articles) was summarized in italicized brackets. However, as the X-Cop Fly Company began to include political commentary, the chapterless post-by-post nature made this material impossible to read.

After setting up LibertyColumns.com, I decided to make a similar *LibertyColumns.com Library* eBook series. As these are original columns rarely making use of material from other sources, the need to summarize linked articles is rare and, if needed, is done via simple footnotes.

Volume I of *LibertyColumns.com Library* contains all posts from 2009 through 2011. These are not "LibertyColumns.com posts" but rather X-Cop Fly Company posts which were copied over to LibertyColumns.com after LibertyColumns.com was created. By including them in *LibertyColumns.com Library*, the columns become easier to read (as per the formatting described above).

This book is dedicated to the public domain according to the Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication. A copy of this waiver (public domain) has been included at the end of this book. Note that this book makes frequent references to others' names and trademarks – these belong to their respective owners, who are not affiliated with this book or its author.

I hope this work proves itself enjoyable to many and will encourage further expansion of the public domain and a loosening of copyright laws and lessening of copyright terms around the world. I look forward to working on Volume II (likely containing the first half of LibertyColumns.com's 2012 material) shortly.

Daniel R. Quintiliani (owner, LibertyColumns.com)
July 8, 2012

“Kenyan-born Obama”: Will they pull a WTC7 or a Philander Knox?

October 17, 2009

The Internet Archive, famous for exposing politicians, contains an article from Nairobi's The (East African) Standard¹ regarding “Kenyan-Born Obama” and his Senate race in 2004.

The Archive's last major exposure happened when videos were discovered from the BBC, CNN, and some local Fox-affiliate channels where the collapse of the Salomon Building (aka WTC7) was reported some 10-20 minutes in advance. Until official responses came forward, these videos were repeatedly removed by Google (YouTube) et al and removed from the Internet Archive. According to the blog link above, so-called “birthers” apparently refer to this as “scrubbing the Internet”

Official explanations from AP, The Standard, and Washington could be given regarding this, but something else comes to mind. In 1986, an income tax protestor pointed out inconsistencies in copies of the Constitution's Sixteenth Amendment (direct federal income tax, ratified 1913) delivered to the states. A federal appeals court (never went any higher) ruled against him, because (1) then-Secretary of State Philander Knox marked it as valid, and (2) “73 years after certification of the amendment's adoption and after countless judicial applications, would promote only disorder.”

The reason this is an issue is because the House and Senate passed resolutions two months ago declaring Obama born in Hawaii. And you can bet there'd be disorder if the courts validate this!

So regardless of the law, Obama will be the 44th President, and there's no stopping anyone.

¹ Note: "The Standard" is now known as "The Standard for Fairness and Justice"

“Blogs vs. Twitter & Facebook” Arguments, As Applied to the Bill of Rights

June 23, 2010

There have been a lot of posts (and political lobbying) within the past few years by a dying Media 1.0 establishment and a gullible public to discourage the creation and reading of blogs, this time by encouraging Twitter and Facebook as *replacements* for blogs.

Rather than go on a standard political rant about this issue like any other blogger would, I thought I'd apply this to each amendment in the Bill of Rights of the US Constitution.

(Note that the content in this article may not apply to blogs hosted on major “community” sites such as Google and Myspace. Since they are run by major corporations, with Myspace owned by the parent company of Fox News, they may be subject to the same/similar issues as Twitter and Facebook.)

1st Amendment: No Establishment of Religion (basis for “Separation of Church and State”), Freedom of Religion, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of the Press, Peaceful Assembly, Right to Petition the Government:

Blogs have empowered the people more than ever, as they expose media bias and blackouts, political scandals, and more corruption you would never find out about on TV or radio. Information about diverse religions and philosophy available on the Internet is discouraging many parents from vaccinating their children by temporarily changing their religion or claiming an exemption. Some religious issues reported by Media 1.0, such as sexual abuse issues in the Catholic Church, have been subject to further debate on blogs – for example, the role of the vow of celibacy required by most priests. Material critical of Islam, such as the movie *Fitna* and depictions of Muhammad, freely spreads through blogs, causing Islamic theocracies to play whack-a-mole, banning entire Web sites and threaten to execute their owners.² As a means of news, blogs containing audio and video, such as embedded material uploaded onto YouTube, have enabled individuals to “broadcast”, regardless of archaic laws. Broadcast licensing was originally designed to prevent interference according to issues not present in the age of GPS, satellites, digital transmissions, and “simulcasting” (the ability to put multiple channels in a single frequency, such as with Digital TV

² Mark Zuckerberg of Facebook might be executed upon entering Pakistan over the 5/20/2010 "Everybody Draw Mohammed Day" incident

and HD Radio). However, they eventually became a means of media control. It took many media blackouts for obscure anti-establishment politician Ron Paul to gain media exposure in 2008, and in the 2004 Democratic primaries an antitrust-minded man named Howard Dean was mocked out of the race over a pep rally. Many grassroots campaigns, spread via blogs, have been highly successful. The Internet has made it easy to send e-mails and faxes to Congressmen and -women, as well as make laws and transcripts available for full viewing.

What gives blogs the advantage with all of this over Twitter or Facebook is the fact that if you own or lease the hardware running your site, you have much more freedom, since the less contracts there are, and the more privacy rights you have (Facebook is notorious for a mysterious “selling out” on the importance of privacy rights some time ago), the freer you are.

2nd Amendment: Right to Bear Arms:

In a world of liberal and neo”conservative” media, true conservatives and libertarians have grown due to blogs. Efforts such as the “Ron Paul Revolution” presidential campaign of 2008, the successor group Campaign for Liberty, and Tea Party protests owe the Internet their success. In opposition to these efforts, bog-standard left-wing charges of “violent racists” and “angry white men” fly at innocent Republicans who now have a new opportunity to speak their mind. And unlike Twitter and Facebook, which respond to any one complaint by banning the user or material immediately, so-called “hate speech” and “harassment” accusations by the left-wing establishment can be resolved more easily and fairly with a hosting provider, even if similar bans are in their contracts.

3rd Amendment: No Quartering of Soldiers:

Many blogs, such as the anarcho-capitalist LewRockwell.com and Justin Raimondo’s Antiwar.com, frequently criticize wars, foreign policy measures, anti-terrorism laws, and the actions of the US military (in fact, LRC is banned from offices of US intelligence agencies). No longer are complaints about the military or government limited to our minds or homes – while none of us, whether criminal or peaceful, are anonymous to authorities in any way, blog pseudonyms enable us to publish all kinds of crazy ideological arguments without our families and friends even knowing. Again, Facebook and Twitter will shut anything “hate speech” down immediately.

4th Amendment: Search & Seizure, Warrants, Right to Privacy:

The establishment has grown very successful in defeating the protections of this amendment. Laws such as the Patriot Act have eroded this right, and social networks and search engines have become goldmines for both private industry and government agencies. Facebook and Twitter are no

exception – those sites store backups of your actions even if you delete your account. Web hosts have their own privacy policies and law enforcement measures which may be much less invasive. Other laws, such as the Digital Millenium Copyright Act, have granted these same broad powers to copyright holders, though in some cases they are used for purpose of censorship³ or forming trust-like “holding” organizations⁴ rather than copyright infringement. And while Media 1.0 will censor or twist anything that reflects badly upon its own industry (or any other industry for that matter⁵), and Facebook has “mysteriously” reversed its stance on privacy rights recently, blogs such as Slashdot have risen to fill in the blanks.

5th Amendment: No Double Jeopardy, No Self-Incrimination, Right to Life, Liberty, and Property, Eminent Domain:

6th Amendment: Right to a Speedy Trial, Nature of Trials:

7th Amendment: Right to Trial By Jury:

Acts which threaten the establishment have led to intelligence agencies and copyright holders to engage in dealmaking which is slowly trending towards entire leasing of your machine. Blogs have been reporting these efforts by Microsoft, Apple, the MAFIAA, and others, as well as reporting hacker attacks on remotely-stored personal data, which is sometimes marketed as “cloud computing”. After eminent domain laws were extremely loosened to allow seizure of property by Wal-Mart⁶, bloggers not only reported the story, but debated the consequences. Trial by jury is being threatened through the expansion of forced arbitration, mandated by a federal law irreversible by states, including to Web sites about cartoon characters⁷, rapists⁸, neglectful murdering nursing homes⁹, and consumer electronics purchases¹⁰, but people are getting together and fighting the law, and some arbitration companies have left consumer dispute markets. The banking industry’s role in the current recession, reported by bloggers with an anti-establishment bias, has helped with this issue as well.

3 *OPG v. Diebold*, in which voting machine manufacturer Diebold attempted to use copyright claims to block hacked corporate content exposing technical flaws in the machines, malicious attitudes, and general foul play. Diebold lost the case.

4 Trusted (aka “treacherous”) computing

5 Failed attempts to advertise “Buy Nothing Day” on Canadian TV

6 *Kelo v. City of New London*

7 The terms of service for Dilbert.com

8 A woman working for Halliburton in Iraq (Jamie Leigh Jones) was raped on the job and could not sue due to signing an arbitration provision upon her hiring.

9 A elderly woman in a nursing home wandered outside of the facility and froze to death. The woman's family could not sue due to them signing an arbitration agreement.

10 Dell places arbitration provisions in their shrinkwrap agreements

8th Amendment: No Cruel or Unusual Punishment:

Information regarding foreign wars have been reported by bloggers, with Media 1.0 dishonesty even being videotaped.¹¹ Torture and other events at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo would be easy to hide if blogs didn't exist, and there would be less questioning the claims made by the President about national security and foreign dictators. The use of pseudonyms have encouraged people to discuss and debate the Israeli lobby without fear of being publicly labeled an anti-Semite, even if they secretly are one.

9th Amendment: Rights Not Limited to Constitution:

As rights such as copyright protection have been broadly expanded in length and scope, bloggers have been making use of Creative Commons licenses to waive such rights for the benefit of themselves and others. This even includes musicians who rely on a cult following and touring, such as Nine Inch Nails and Radiohead, who have left major labels and still kept their fans. Some have gone even further and released material entirely into the public domain, as controversial creationist figure Kent Hovind once did. I myself have released much of this blog's content into the public domain.¹²

10th Amendment: States' Rights, Other Rights Belong to States & People:

Due to dissatisfaction with the establishment, fueled by blogs and the Tea Party movement, many libertarians have started a "Tenther" movement, proposing that the US become a confederacy where states have nullification rights over an ever-expanding federal government. Many want to repeal other Constitutional amendments associated with infringing on states' rights, including parts of the 14th (birthright citizenship, bill of rights applies to states), the 16th (direct federal income tax), and the 17th (senate popularly elected like the house is, something I want to see repealed). Twitter and Facebook, once again, will shut down anything after somebody points the race card.

27th Amendment: Limiting Congressional Pay:

(part of original Bill of Rights, but not ratified until 1992)

Bloggers have been able to monitor Congress like never before, including not only laws and transcripts in their entirety, but also exposing financial and sexual scandals, ties to various lobbies, and other forms of corruption Media 1.0 would never report, and would be extremely difficult to spread via Twitter.

¹¹ Referring to a video showing a completely-staged CNN Desert Storm report, with rehearsal clips showing a blue screen, fake missiles and sound effects, along with clips of stoned reporters having a good time.

¹² At the time, I was referring to XCopFly.com. It also applies to LibertyColumns.com as of July 8, 2012

Thoughts on funding of “cures” for psychiatric illnesses

November 11, 2010

(Slightly abridged from something I posted to Usenet earlier tonight)

We need to cut any and all government funding of public, private, nonprofit, and academic efforts researching “curing” mental illness, autism, retardation, etc. because there is a major conflict of interest issue.

Unlike medication, which treats symptoms such as depression, anxiety, paranoia, attentiveness, etc., a “cure” implies that one’s personality would be permanently altered for life, and in order to be defined as a “cure”, it would have to be irreversible.

This creates a major problem – what is the “normal” and “sane” personality? It could be the personality that does not suffer from delusions, is capable of full social interaction, knows what type of discussion is warranted and where, and functions well in the workplace – as most people view it today. But it can also be personalities that follow all laws, do not question authority, have a materialistic lifestyle which can easily be “sold to”, someone who rejects or accepts God, the “tolerant” person. In other words, this could lead to an unexpected “standard” – a vulnerable, apathetic, and easily-manipulated person lacking free will, freedom of thought, and a free conscience.

When taken to the unborn child, we can also be born “customized” to have the biggest breasts, the perfect weight, the Hollywood body, bodies suited for porn, bodies suited for advertising and modeling, voices well-suited for TV, music, and acting. Sound familiar? Yes, it could just as well be blond hair and blue eyes. Pricing would become tied to economic class and social status as prospective parents pay for the “perfect” body and mind – or have your child face social rejection and discrimination not unlike the victims of racial segregation, Communism, World War II, and Apartheid.

But what does this all have to do with government? Wouldn’t accepting a “cure” be an individual choice?

As the price of such a surgery or other treatment will drop, insurance companies and socialized medicine would begin to force this treatment on the mentally handicapped without their consent. (One surgery, or thousands of dollars worth of prescription drugs and counseling?) There is too much money to save when an illness is no longer chronic.

As the government has the sole power to force such a treatment (through directives to programs like Medicare and Medicaid), and to permit or deny private industry to force such a treatment (through regulation of the insurance companies), there is a major conflict of interest, and all public (and hopefully private) funding of these mental, cognitive, and retardation “cure” groups should immediately stop.

Repealing The 17th Amendment: Dealing With Politicians And Special Interests

February 21, 2011

(The following article was submitted to the Repeal the 17th Amendment¹³ blog)

Probably one of the toughest obstacles to repealing the 17th amendment is the fact that the careers of senators are put in jeopardy. Many people believe that a constitutional convention by the states is the only possible way to repeal the 17th amendment, which can also be viewed as too risky due to the fact that the Constitution and Bill of Rights might be tampered with. However, there is a very easy way to have a 17th repeal pass Congress.

The 17th amendment, as ratified in 1913, concludes with:

“This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.”

Since 1913, however, the structure of political power has changed quite a bit (which the 17th amendment helped alter). Within the past decade especially, it seems that Congress is heading more and more into a parliamentary system, in which the party rather than the politician has the vote. This is very apparent in the fact that some recent bills are hundreds or even thousands of pages, as was true of the Patriot Act and Obamacare, and are not being read by the politicians despite being passed into law.

While the 17th may have guaranteed senators a safe end to their career, a repeal of the 17th will leave the political parties and lobbyists scrambling to find a new strategy for levying their agenda.

It is for this reason that a repeal of the 17th amendment in the 21st century should take effect upon the death, resignation, or election loss of a senator rather than the end of the senator's current term. In other words, Senator X and Senator Y will remain senators so long as they continue to participate in and win popular elections.

¹³ <http://repealthe17thamendment.blogspot.com/> (owned by Brian Duffy)

This may be viewed as controversial, as depending on the voters' political views it could lead to a near-infinite amount of terms guaranteed to senators. However, there are several benefits which are not obvious:

1. Increased voter turnout. As long as Senator X and Senator Y continue to win elections, the people will be happy that their "right to vote for senators" still exists so long as they continue to vote for their current senators. As a variety of elections and referendums take place on election years, people would vote for other candidates as well, and thus voter turnout would be greater.

2. Increased attention to state and local politics. State and local candidates are often ignored. If more people participate in these elections, they can learn not only about how their state's politics work, but also how their vote affects the state's choice in senators. Perhaps more will learn why their vote for senator isn't "counting" and senators will lose elections faster. Increased public involvement in state politics would discourage corruption at the state level, including corruption in Senate choices after the 17th is repealed. It would also help educate the public about their state government, its importance and necessity, and its role in our federalist system.

3. Professional and academic comparisons between elected and appointed senators. The effects of a repeal could be seen as it is happening. If California is still holding senate races, while Montana is not, the two states could be compared with regard to the influence of special interests, the size of the federal government, the focus on state politics, the durations of senators in office, and anything else a think tank, college, or pollster can come up with.

4. Special interests will inevitably push for resignations. As Lord Acton stated, power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. State politics are no exception, and special interests will corrupt the choice in senators as they had before the 17th. Once lobbyists have come up with ways to deal with the individual states, organizations and talking heads will slowly endorse resignations of senators once they are ready to attack.

While this proposal is radical and will leave many voters unhappy, such a transition will encourage ratification of a 17th repeal at the federal level, leaving the remainder of the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, safe and intact.

Maybe I should say it on my own blog instead of repeating the same stuff everywhere else over and over again.

March 25, 2011

(This was posted as a comment to a 17th-amendment-related blog¹⁴ and thus more tailored to it, but I still repeat the same facts again and again in every right-wing blog & message board.)

The link between the 17th and the Fed is extremely weak.

Everyone seems to always forget that the Fed did not repeal the gold standard in 1913. Nixon did so in 1971 in order to continue the welfare-warfare state.

Silver was pulled in 1965 for the same reason the penny was inverted in 1982. That preceded the removal of the gold standard by half a decade. The pre-1971 silver-clad half dollar was strictly nostalgic as it was the same 1965 law which set the timeline, not the repeal of the gold standard in 1971 (which again was done by Nixon, not the Fed).

However, there is no link whatsoever between the income tax and either of those things. The income tax simply added a means of revenue raising for the federal government which was declared unconstitutional in 1895. This case occurred almost two decades before the 16th Amendment was ratified. How the money for the welfare-warfare state is raised does not matter. In fact, the 16th amendment took a burden away from the states as the federal government could do more on its own.

This “1913” stuff is complete nonsense and I’m getting tired of repeating the facts again and again on every blog and message board. The gold standard was pulled in 1971, not “1913”. Silver was removed in 1965 due to electronics-driven inflation, not “1913”. The federal income tax was first attempted in 1895, not “1913”.

If we are going to repeal the 17th amendment, we need to avoid this “1913” stuff if we are going to have any credibility beyond the likes of Alex Jones and George Noory.

¹⁴ Ibid.

The main problem with conservatism and the Republican Party

March 31, 2011

Conservatives always define one of their key goals as “limited government”. But what is “limited government”? The definition conservatives usually give includes less regulations on businesses, less funding for government programs, less government agencies, etc.

But what exactly is to limit? And how much do we limit it? We can support “free speech on the Internet”, yet shut down “unpatriotic” leaked material, or leave surveillance measures in place, whether for the prevention of “terrorism” or to increase the profits of the dying Hollywood/Media 1.0 political machine. We can support “family values”, but pass laws of censorship and prohibition which take the power of families to enforce values which might not be compatible with the current powers-that-be. We can be “pro-life”, yet support trade agreements and foreign aid packages which encourage or mandate legalized abortion in other countries, not to mention kill massive amounts of “life” in international never-ending wars against random countries in the Middle East and Africa. We can oppose “socialized health care” but give the FDA sweeping powers to seize material from individual’s homes at the request of Monsanto. We can oppose “global warm<<<<<<<<<<climate change<<<<<<disruption”, yet institute a new tax in order to win support from moderates in passing a completely unrelated bill which “bails out” a mismanaged “American institution” such as a failing car company or bank in the also-Republican moderate’s district.

This is the key problem with conservatism – the “limited” part is subjected to the will of the “government” part. Government has proven itself inefficient, poorly-managed, corrupt, collusive, and untrustworthy. Instead of “limited” government, we instead need *eliminated* government. Rather than cut programs, cut *laws*. Rather than defund, *delegislate*. Rather than giving doctors, drug companies, and oil companies unchallengeable free reign over our health and safety and calling it “reform”, eliminate these “reform” laws and let the courts do their job. A lawsuit would not be a “law” as it would only affect the people in the case, not ban all Americans from protecting their dying grandmother as a federal “malpractice reform” law would.

The Republican Party took this “deregulatory” attitude in the latter half of the 1990s, and basically had the winning formula for a good economy and free society. However, their “deregulation” was based on this same subjective concept of “limited” government, and special interest politics led to large amounts of lip service (most notably re-defining the phrase “free trade” to mean “trade agreement” and massive transfers of national sovereignty) which eventually resulted in an abandonment of the idea of “limited government” altogether.

We cannot have laws to prevent other laws. We cannot have limits to keep limits in place. We especially cannot trust the same government that passes laws to “limit” other ones. Every new law passed is at least one more infringement on our rights to life, liberty, and property. What we need is a new Republican Party platform, which is not grounded in “limited” government, but “eliminated” government. Only then can we be a free nation and a free people under a free, stable, and desirable economy.

It is obvious...

April 5, 2011

It is obvious America is now an occupied nation. Voting is irrelevant as politicians reject the intent of their voters with such defiance and rudeness, passing more and more laws and fighting more and more wars which nobody approves of but themselves. [According to President George W. Bush, the Constitution is as worthless as paper.] [Politicians treat the Constitution as] a set of procedures and a couple of judges that get in their way. America is no longer a democratic republic, but a fascist republic, occupied in the same “hand-over” manner which created the Axis Powers of WWII and the kings and queens of long ago, where individuals have little say in the fate of their lives and liberties, and much say in trying to figure out ways for themselves and their loved ones to keep it.

How To Discover Media Bias

May 26, 2011

I've always had a personal "sixth sense" regarding deciphering fact from lie in news reports. This is not limited to "conservative bias" or "liberal bias," but events and ideas accepted by Media 1.0 as dogmatic fact and interpreted in the biases of the different news outlets.

Many people view me as a conspiracy theorist for this, and you might be considered one as well, but read on.

The way to tell is via continuity in current events, and this is especially easy for short-term situations. Here is one example of a short-term situation:

Within the course of one week:

1. Michelle *[sic]* Bachmann, Republican congresswoman, reverses her stance on the legitimacy of Obama's "Certification of Live Birth"
2. Obama releases long-coveted "Long Form Birth Certificate"
3. Conservative pundits all immediately accept this certificate as legitimate fact
4. The "birther" argument is disproven (according to Media 1.0)

Here is another long-term example, this one is an issue which is in progress and has not come to an end (due to lack of full implementation):

1. (Now-retired) Sen. Fritz Hollings wants mandatory copy protection built into every electronic device, "Consumer Broadband and Digital Television Promotion Act" is fought and never becomes law. Copy protection involves copyright-owner control of how information/media/device is used by its physical owner, mandated by the WIPO treaty (implemented in the US as "DMCA") as illegal to tamper with, even for otherwise-legal purposes by people who own the physical product in their homes
2. Soon after, private "Trusted Computing Group" forms, fighting for "trusted computing" – defined as "various security technologies" including the "remote attestation" system above marketed instead as "protect-you-from-viruses" and "protect-you-from-

yourself”.

3. TCG comes out with a statement that TC requires human activation, but refuses to give the remote attestation system a separate activation (“owner override”) because it “defeats the purpose” of the remote attestation system
4. Linux kernel contains “optional” trusted computing support, which must be compiled out (from the same product by the same people)
5. NSA’s SELinux, another “security” grab-bag which includes “remote attestation”, wins no-bid contract (there were private alternatives, nothing positive implied) to be hard-coded into the kernel (the same people as above)
6. Apple switches to Intel processors for its Macs, which were less-powerful and less-secure than the original non-TC-capable PowerPC processors for “power-saving” purposes
7. The new Mac’s TC is used to prevent installing Intel-compatible Windows on such machines, legally enforced over the computer’s physical owner due to the DMCA, enabling Apple to continue monopolizing the hardware market
8. NSA busted for illegal surveillance of phone calls, President Bush becomes a felon
9. NSA sued by civil liberties groups
10. NSA granted immunity by a Democratic Congress
11. Windows Vista debuts with portions of trusted computing (such as the optional “BitLocker” “security tool”)

Here is a popular and much simpler long-term example, used by 9/11 “Truthers”

1. 9/11 occurs
2. Government invades Afghanistan
3. Government invades Iraq for supposed WMDs
4. Saddam Hussein killed
5. WMDs never found
6. Obama elected, promising to end war
7. Obama instead starts three new wars

Does this way of analyzing the news make you a conspiracy theorist? No, the belief in a conspiracy is up to you. In the last “truther” example, belief in foreknowledge is not necessary – it could be simply be dishonest exploitation of Al-Qaeda’s unexpected attacks.

I hope this opens your eyes and have you look at the news in a different way, and hopefully Media 1.0 will lose all alleged credibility and collapse under a lack of ratings while alternative media (and the minds of its readers) will grow.

Ayn Rand Isn't Libertarianism, She Destroys It

June 17, 2011

There's been a lot in the news lately about how the Tea Party conservatives, like many libertarians, are fans of Ayn Rand's works. Others, especially left-wing mainstream media outlets and (rightfully) concerned Christians, are pointing out the incompatibilities between Religious Right Christianity and Rand's philosophy, Objectivism.

Ayn Rand's belief in free markets has motivated many libertarians, from the time her books were written through today's Tea Party Movement. However, Ayn Rand was not simply a free-market capitalist. Capitalism was simply a part of her philosophy known as Objectivism, in which selfishness was the greatest good, and "altruism" was an evil which should be avoided. She actually hated libertarianism and the newly-founded Libertarian Party for this very reason – she felt it was reducing her philosophy to the political ideology held by the anti-federalist Founding Fathers and the supporters of laissez-faire economics.

The truth about Objectivism, however, is that selfishness trumps everything which is inconvenient and unwanted. Like religion, which Rand opposed, political ideology and philosophy can easily get in someone's way. The influence of selfishness on ideology has led to several contradictions held by a majority of libertarians:

1. Abortion – most libertarians are pro-choice (inconvenience trumps an act of aggression)
2. Unions – unions, even peaceful ones, are always "anti-free-market", even when unionization has not been banned by contract (getting out of a jam trumps nonviolent freedom of association and the right to manage one's own career and finances)
3. Gold standard, even the tyrannical Bretton Woods ban on gold ownership (a stable economic system trumps freedom to choose any form of money, forms of money used in tribal cultures, privacy rights, and private property rights)
4. Removing restrictions on natural medicine and vitamins – often libertarian supporters of natural medicine go further and want government to *outlaw* GMOs, hormones, and similar dangerous and risky food and prescription drugs – strangely these views are held by many libertarians[, who are apparently more concerned with convenience than libertarianism]

5. Copyright and patent as intellectual “property” (power and control trumps all other rights and justifies seizure, breaking-and-entering, surveillance, extortion of businesses and consumers, etc.)

Given the potential, it is no surprise that Ayn Rand was extremely strict on that last example, modern copyright law owes a lot to her and her followers (such as Andrew Joseph Galambos). She also made use of the welfare system under her husband’s last name. Her associate Alan Greenspan, once an advocate of the gold standard, became the chairman of the Federal Reserve almost two decades after their gold money monopoly was reduced to paper Monopoly money.

As an atheist, Rand knew you cannot follow religion and hold selfishness as the greatest good, since avoiding the “wrong” and “sinful” and “bad karma” tends to get in the way of your wants and needs. But she completely ignored free-market capitalism as an impediment. Rand’s harmful influence on conservatism and libertarianism continues to this day, destroying the minds of many well-intentioned limited-government politicians and leading them to place money and power above all else. When selfishness is your god, there can be no other.

The Seven Deadly Dogmas of Public Life

June 23, 2011

Over the years I have come to the conclusion that there are a handful of issues which are neither discussed, debated, nor opposed by both politicians and the mainstream media. This is regardless of political party, ideology, columnist, or pundit – there seems to be a few things which are unanimously supported and if they are even discussed, it is always positively portrayed, unanimously promoted, and unanimously passed.

There are at least seven I can think of right now:

1. No questioning of the safety, efficacy, or legality of developments and technologies in the agribusiness industry.
2. Unconditional support for the government of Israel and its current agenda.
3. Maintaining the idea that Islam is a “religion of peace”, with any proselytizing through force being an extremist viewpoint, despite verses in the Koran and hundreds of years of history which (unlike Christianity) have yet to be apologized for and continue to happen all over the world.
4. Rejection, ridiculing, and promoting stereotypes regarding the Catholic Church’s socially conservative views.
5. Increasing any and all enforcement of intellectual property rights; any related laws, powers, and treaties; making terms as lengthy as possible; and linking it with the Founding Fathers’ view of property protection, despite literal interpretation of the Constitution’s authorized grants, the nonexistence of the idea of “intellectual property” at the time, and not discussing any history regarding the issue prior to the invention of the concept in the 1960s and implementation around the world since then.
6. Provisions of multilateral trade agreements and foreign aid packages which authorize or mandate legalized abortion are conveniently overlooked by “pro-life” politicians and never discussed by the mainstream media.
7. No discussion of antitrust law or any enforcement of it, other than ongoing litigation initiated by the DOJ. The DOJ is always portrayed negatively, though if they win the DOJ is portrayed positively during the aftermath.

(Note: inclusion of items in this list doesn't imply anything about my views)

There are countless others, I'm sure. I've seen a decrease in the size of the list since people such as Judge Napolitano and the Pauls have risen in popularity. But the establishment still has a long way to go before it ceases to force its (and only its) views on others.

The End of the Internet

June 26, 2011

Many years ago there was a commercial for broadband in which someone reached “the end of the Internet” and was told to press the back button – offering the opportunities of a broadband connection when compared to dial-up.

But now it seems we are really reaching the end.

Governments around the world are censoring and shutting down as much of the Internet as it can. Whether it be China blocking political dissent, Pakistan, Iran, or Libya enforcing a theocratic religion, North Korea restricting the Internet to an elite few, or our latest player in Internet censorship, the United States, seizing the competitors of its darling, dying, lying Hollywood/Media 1.0 political machine, it is clear the Internet is the enemy of all governments.

Why?

The Internet is the enemy of governments for the same reason you are – you get in their way. Otherwise the only governments in existence would be the story of the wicked queen and the movie about the empire in space. Governments of the world have created a monster which is now destroying the concept of government itself.

This is the Internet’s dying days, and a restoration of the propaganda monopolies, the dismembering of infidels, the single-party states, with no opposition or competition except those in prison and death row.

What can we do?

Close your Facebook account. Play an offline game. Play solitaire with a real deck of cards, perhaps learn some other solitaire games not included with Windows. Put on the radio. Put away your Kindles and iPods and grab fully-tangible alternatives which you can completely control, and enjoy yourself. Draw a picture. Write a story or poem. Sing a song, or play an instrument. If you (think you) suck, stop caring and just have fun. Go down to your local church, your soup kitchen, your

fraternal group, and do some good for your soul and for your community. Go outside just to walk around and hang out. And if you put on your TV, realize that every news report is at least partially a lie, every cartoon is designed to dumb-down your children, and every sitcom uses vices to keep you feeling as empty as possible to increase the profits of its advertisers.

Enjoy the Internet while you can, because the Internet is being shut down, and someday it will be shut down.

But never let them shut you down. Ever.

Obama's Clones and the Split Tea Party Movement: Thoughts On The Straw Poll

August 14, 2011

I'm very happy with the 2011 Ames straw poll results – Michele Bachmann the winner at 28.55%, and Ron Paul not too far behind at 27.65%, with none of the other candidates passing 14%.

While the Ames straw poll is more about showcasing dedication to the candidates, the candidate's marketing skills, and the character of potential voters, it does bring to my mind a problem which might destroy the Tea Party and the Republican vote in 2012.

As everyone within the Tea Party Movement knows, there are the more conservative people (such as Michele Bachmann and Sarah Palin) and the more libertarian people (such as Judge Napolitano and Ron Paul).

When you look at the other candidates in the race, they are basically clones of Barack Obama. Two key examples: Mitt Romney being the pro-choice inventor of Obamacare and inventor of “the mandate”, and Rick Perry forcing 11-year-old girls to get the religiously-controversial and painful HPV vaccine Gardasil via executive order (later blocked by the TX legislature).

It is schizophrenic that Republicans are even giving these people TV time let alone supporting their candidacy, given their opposition to Obama doing the exact same thing. It's the same as my frequent statements here¹⁵ about the open-source software community – unconditional support of any related companies or nonprofits, despite having welcomed and implemented the exact same tie-ins with the Langley/Ft. Meade surveillance state and the Hollywood Mafia as the proprietary software they criticize.

Liberals constantly accuse conservatives of being racist or driven by racism when it comes to opposing the President's views and actions. But if the Tea Party continues to split the vote between Bachmann and Paul, we may have two pro-choice, big-government, pro-welfare/warfare-state candidates in 2012, with very few differences. In other words, White Obama vs. Black Obama. Thus voting for Mitt Romney or Rick Perry *will* make you a racist, and with Media 1.0 on his side, the President will have a second term.

¹⁵ On XCopFly.com and LibertyColumns.com

Here is my suggestion – rather than go by the candidate you support, go by the date of your state's primaries. For example, I support Ron Paul, but PA being one of the later states to hold primaries, I might vote for Bachmann if she has already won states or did better than Ron Paul when both lost a previous state.

We cannot have four more years of a pro-choice, pro-welfare/warfare-state, big-government liberal, whether he be Democratic or Republican, black or white. No matter who we support, the Tea Party vote cannot be split in our fight against Obama, nor can we take more accusations of racism. I suggest we base our votes not on our support for Bachmann or Paul, but on their success so far. Only then can the Tea Party win in 2012.

Didn't Talk Radio Teach You Anything? Republicans, Wake Up!

September 6, 2011

The repeal of the Fairness Doctrine in 1987, the passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and the commercialization of the Internet since the mid-1990s has assisted the rise of alternate forms of media – conservative and libertarian talk radio, the conservative viewpoints permitted on Fox's channels, and of course, blogs of all persuasions.

This led to a questioning of the agendas and viewpoints promoted by the Mainstream Media 1.0 – the Big 3 broadcast channels (ABC, CBS, NBC), the government-funded PBS and NPR, and early cable TV sources such as CNN and its Headline News.

But something dangerous is happening right now, something which is undoing the skepticism Media 2.0 has proven a requirement for an informed mind, something threatening both the existence of limited-government conservatism and threatening the Judeo-Christian family values long gone from the mainstream liberal establishment media. As the 2012 Republican presidential primaries approach, conservatives are giving the *same blind trust* to the most popular players in Media 2.0 as they did to Media 1.0!

Polls seem to show the two major candidates for the 2012 Republican presidency are Rick Perry and Mitt Romney. These two individuals are packed with a record of not only major domestic spending and large intrusive government, but beliefs held and actions taken which are pro-choice, pro-Islam, anti-Judeo-Christian, anti-*family* (let alone family values), and other qualities of our Democratic President Barack Hussein Obama.

All you need to know about Mitt Romney is that he invented Obamacare, *including its pro-choice elements*, which he implemented in the state of Massachusetts. Romney's MassHealth also includes "the mandate" – the unconstitutional requirement that everyone purchase health insurance or be fined as a criminal. Aren't we suing over this in federal court? Will all the conservative and Republican organizations, trying to overturn "the mandate" in federal court, drop their charges – just because a Republican President is forcing us to buy insurance instead of a Democratic one? No sane Republican can support the contradiction that is a Mitt Romney presidency.

Even less of a conservative is Rick Perry. Rick Perry is not only a Muslim sympathizer, but befriends jihadist organizations. Sound familiar?¹⁶ Rick Perry goes to Tea Party conventions, telling them what they want to hear, only to go to a neocon convention and contradict himself. His “job creation” was for shady purposes.¹⁷

And in what should appall anyone with a child, Perry forced, through executive order, 11-year-old girls to have the HPV vaccine Gardasil. This vaccine, which girls often claim is extremely painful all the way in and has caused deaths, is rarely useful for anything other than encouraging sexual promiscuity. It was approved under “pro-life” George W. Bush’s FDA, famous for putting the abortion pill over-the-counter and being so pro-business even businesses themselves found the FDA’s actions repulsive. It took an act of the Texas Legislature to block Perry’s highly inappropriate behavior.

There are only two major candidates in the race who can legitimately be considered “conservative” – Michele Bachmann and Ron Paul. They have few differences in domestic policy, differing primarily in foreign policy – Bachmann taking a Reagan/Bush I/II neocon approach and Paul taking a Goldwater/Buchanan paleoconservative/paleolibertarian approach. Unfortunately, the Tea Party vote is split between them, making matters worse for Judeo-Christian limited-government conservatives.

Media 2.0 has proven pre-existing Media 1.0 cannot be trusted. So what are Republicans doing? Blindly trusting pre-existing Media 2.0! Unlike the mainstream Media 1.0, Media 2.0 has no limits. Go and dig up everything you can on these candidates. A liberal neocon Republican who differs from a Democratic President in nothing but race is a guaranteed second term. Remember what Media 2.0 has taught you – don’t blindly follow any form of media. Keep the skepticism and suspicion every patriotic American needs, discover different points of view, and cast an informed, intelligent vote in 2012.

¹⁶ Sound like Obama?

¹⁷ Rick Perry’s “jobs” were public works projects relating to the construction of the Trans-Texas Corridor (aka “NAFTA Superhighway”)

Thoughts on Ron Paul's statements at Monday's Tea Party debate regarding terrorism

September 14, 2011

Watching the Tea Party GOP Debate on CNN on Monday, I was glad to see the liberal mainstream media channel grill the candidates with tough questions, and was also happy to see Rick Perry confronted by the other candidates regarding his Gardasil mandate – surprised me something like that would ever happen on establishment television, let alone by establishment candidates such as Romney and (the now-Big-Government) Gingrich, and best of all this confrontation showcased non-establishment Michele Bachmann's ideological conservatism. The American people are tired of empty, generic promises (such as "Hope" and "Change"), and the GOP especially should not trust a candidate who defends his left-wing behavior with an "I'm sorry!" Also notable regarding Rick Perry was his repeated defense of his left-wing policies in Texas by claiming "state's rights". Herman Cain's executive skills were showcased by his pizza-chain-style marketing of his "9/9/9" tax plan.

Ron Paul was meeting the challenges presented by establishment candidates very well, but he blew it with Rick Santorum's last-minute attack regarding Ron's views on Islamic terrorism.

One of Ron's more controversial platform planks deals with the reason for Muslim terrorism's targeting of America – Ron feels that it is *only* because of anger over neocon intervention in the Middle East. In the 2008 presidential primary debate season, he famously sparred with Rudy Giuliani by maintaining this view over the popular GOP viewpoint that Muslims hate our freedom. This time, however, Ron Paul used the phrase "in their [the Palestinians'] homeland", making himself look guilty of treason to the mainstream Republican base.

Ron Paul is clearly wrong on this issue – he is right that Muslim terrorism is *motivated* by American intervention and our friendliness toward Israel – but their holy book the Quran, and thousands of years of history yet to be apologized for by religious leaders, continue to confirm Islam's violent opposition to freedom of religion for not only Judaism itself, but Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, tribal paganism, and every other religion other than Islam. Disputes with Israel over the right to land are overshadowed by Islam's demand that *all* land follow the Quran's mandate of global sharia law.

Regardless of these views, I truly hope that Ron Paul gets out of this mess of poor semantics, wins states and (hopefully) the Presidency.

Copyleft Risks – An Answer from RMS

October 2, 2011

If you've read my blog, you may have seen my frequent statements regarding copyleft, and how due to the structure of tax-deductible incorporated nonprofits, management changes and donor ties may result in forced donations or sabotage to the freeness of free software and other copyleft schemes such as Creative Commons ShareAlike.

Yesterday I had the privilege of attending a debate between Richard Stallman and Nina Paley in Scranton, PA.¹⁸ Despite the rain, it was a very nice afternoon. Stallman started us off with a discussion on current and upcoming threats to privacy rights and private property rights by the federal government and through claims of super-property rights over people's homes and possessions (aka "intellectual property"). Very scary stuff, and sadly I worry about how Gen Y only cares about letters and brand names. Paley discussed the difficulty in obtaining rights to make her movie *Sita Sings the Blues*, the temptation for artists to keep a full copyright, and the inability to waive rights in certain jurisdictions.

Given my inability to find a definite answer to my question, I thought I'd take advantage of the moment to ask the head guy himself about risks to free software due to management changes or donor ties to bad people, using as an example the weakness of the GPLv3 compared to Stallman's early drafts which would have killed TC and DRM on the spot.

Stallman was a bit upset with me for a supposed lack of trust in the FSF, and was fully confident that the "or" in "or any later version" made this situation impossible. Because Stallman and Paley wound up in a Ron-Paul-style situation of principle being cut off for time, and I was making things longer, the moderator told me rudely to "stop". (He could have used a better word.)

After the Q&A, Stallman put on his robe and halo did his famous "Church of Emacs" stand-up act. It's a fun skit and I was happy to see it live.

¹⁸ "Free as in Freedom", a debate between Richard Stallman and Nina Paley which occurred on October 1, 2011 in Scranton, PA, as part of the 2011 Pages & Places book festival.

As I left, Stallman and Paley were greeting people. I spoke to Stallman and apologized, and he told me that my argument was FUD¹⁹, that the risk doesn't exist and that he "set things up so it could never happen."

Still I disagree, since "or and later version" could be applied by the organization itself, and a sabotaged FSF could do anything it wants, including demanding random tax-deductible donations, removing "or" in subsequent revisions, and taking of rights over (parts of) the software. This risk increases over time, due to changes in law and treaty outlasting the life of Stallman and his contemporaries. Recall that one reason for the GPLv3 was to make things more applicable outside the US.

I was very happy, however, to finally receive an answer to this question, straight from RMS himself.

¹⁹ "Fear, Uncertainty, and Doubt" – tactics used by supporters of proprietary software (usually Microsoft) in order to discourage use of open-source software.

Pro-Choice Herman Cain is a Fiscal Liberal Too: The Proof is Extremely Obvious

October 26, 2011

As you know, Cain's 9/9/9 tax plan is 9% corporate income tax, 9% individual income tax, and an all-new 9% sales tax.

Conservatives debate over that last one, as a brand-new form of federal taxation is as irreversible as the income tax (or even your closest toll highway/bridge).

But if pizza-chain-style marketing is Cain's focus, there are existing forms of taxes he could lower to 9%:

- 9% existing excise taxes
- 9% Social Security/Medicare taxes
- 9% estate taxes
- 9% capital gains tax

He could also split those taxes up and only tax some of them (9% tax on stock funds, repeal all taxes on money market funds)

But why does Herman Cain want to create a new 9% tax? Especially with left-wing Europe having a similar tax?

He is a big-government liberal. Just like Romney, just like Perry, just like post-9/11 Gingrich – left-wing Obama clones, taking over both political parties.

There are only three people who can be called conservative: Ron Paul, Michele Bachmann, and (a “stretch”, given the Bush II years) Rick Santorum. Due to his record of cutting, repealing, and voting against every big-government scheme he possibly can, Ron Paul is the best choice for America. But other than Paul, Bachmann and Santorum are the only people who can honestly call themselves Republicans. No other candidates can legitimately be supported by any conservative, unless these conservatives became radical Obama leftists within the past two years.

The Legacy of Obamacare: The Death of the Small Business

November 24, 2011

Much has been written about Obama's domestic policies. However, they all seem to have one thing in common: the end of the American small business. "Starting your own business" may have been filled with red tape before, but now it is outright dangerous and could put you in jail just for trying.

An obvious example would be Obamacare.

If you want to start a business, Obamacare makes you a criminal before you even have a chance to grow. Unless you have a lot of money to begin with, the requirement to not only pay health insurance but offer health insurance to employees makes every new business start out as a criminal racket.

Not only are millions of unemployed and partially-employed Americans about to become guilty of federal crimes in 2014 for inability to afford a fine, but for businesses there is a separate demand for compliance. Unless you have guaranteed profits and employee compensation to match Big Pharma's government-mandated demands, starting a small business is extremely dangerous and could have serious criminal consequences for all involved in a non-Fortune-500 company.

And this "legacy" will be permanent on the United States. Already are all Media-1.0-appointed "electable" and "top tier" Republican candidates supporters of abortion²⁰, Islam²¹, forced vaccinations²², socialist national health care, a new Eurotax²³, and mandates of all kinds which were heresy to us only 2 years ago.

The Republican voter base has joined the socialist Occupy Wall Street movement in their support for Clinton/Gore-era generic promises of "creating jobs", throwing away Judeo-Christian family values, the right to life, limited government, personal and economic freedom, and all other things we rallied and marched for only 2 years ago. We are allowing the mainstream Media 1.0 to choose a liberal candidate for us, rather than conservatives like Ron Paul and Michele Bachmann.

²⁰ Herman Cain

²¹ Rick Perry

²² Ibid.

²³ Herman Cain

When compared to other countries, America was always a great place to further your education and start a business. As time went on and liberals passed laws, this became tougher, but it was still possible. But now Obamacare has destroyed all opportunities, turning us all into indentured criminals begging for a better job to pay our back-due fines to Big Pharma. This has got to stop.

Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication

CREATIVE COMMONS CORPORATION IS NOT A LAW FIRM AND DOES NOT PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICES. DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT CREATE AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP. CREATIVE COMMONS PROVIDES THIS INFORMATION ON AN "AS-IS" BASIS. CREATIVE COMMONS MAKES NO WARRANTIES REGARDING THE USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OR THE INFORMATION OR WORKS PROVIDED HEREUNDER, AND DISCLAIMS LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM THE USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OR THE INFORMATION OR WORKS PROVIDED HEREUNDER.

Statement of Purpose

The laws of most jurisdictions throughout the world automatically confer exclusive Copyright and Related Rights (defined below) upon the creator and subsequent owner(s) (each and all, an "owner") of an original work of authorship and/or a database (each, a "Work").

Certain owners wish to permanently relinquish those rights to a Work for the purpose of contributing to a commons of creative, cultural and scientific works ("Commons") that the public can reliably and without fear of later claims of infringement build upon, modify, incorporate in other works, reuse and redistribute as freely as possible in any form whatsoever and for any purposes, including without limitation commercial purposes. These owners may contribute to the Commons to promote the ideal of a free culture and the further production of creative, cultural and scientific works, or to gain reputation or greater distribution for their Work in part through the use and efforts of others.

For these and/or other purposes and motivations, and without any expectation of additional consideration or compensation, the person associating CC0 with a Work (the "Affirmer"), to the extent that he or she is an owner of Copyright and Related Rights in the Work, voluntarily elects to apply CC0 to the Work and publicly distribute the Work under its terms, with knowledge of his or her Copyright and Related Rights in the Work and the meaning and intended legal effect of CC0 on those rights.

1. Copyright and Related Rights. A Work made available under CC0 may be protected by copyright and related or neighboring rights ("Copyright and Related Rights"). Copyright and Related Rights include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. the right to reproduce, adapt, distribute, perform, display, communicate, and translate a Work;
- ii. moral rights retained by the original author(s) and/or performer(s);
- iii. publicity and privacy rights pertaining to a person's image or likeness depicted in a Work;
- iv. rights protecting against unfair competition in regards to a Work, subject to the limitations in paragraph 4(a), below;
- v. rights protecting the extraction, dissemination, use and reuse of data in a Work;
- vi. database rights (such as those arising under Directive 96/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 1996 on the legal protection of databases, and under any national implementation thereof, including any amended or successor version of such

- directive); and
- vii. other similar, equivalent or corresponding rights throughout the world based on applicable law or treaty, and any national implementations thereof.

2. Waiver. To the greatest extent permitted by, but not in contravention of, applicable law, Affirmer hereby overtly, fully, permanently, irrevocably and unconditionally waives, abandons, and surrenders all of Affirmer's Copyright and Related Rights and associated claims and causes of action, whether now known or unknown (including existing as well as future claims and causes of action), in the Work (i) in all territories worldwide, (ii) for the maximum duration provided by applicable law or treaty (including future time extensions), (iii) in any current or future medium and for any number of copies, and (iv) for any purpose whatsoever, including without limitation commercial, advertising or promotional purposes (the "Waiver"). Affirmer makes the Waiver for the benefit of each member of the public at large and to the detriment of Affirmer's heirs and successors, fully intending that such Waiver shall not be subject to revocation, rescission, cancellation, termination, or any other legal or equitable action to disrupt the quiet enjoyment of the Work by the public as contemplated by Affirmer's express Statement of Purpose.

3. Public License Fallback. Should any part of the Waiver for any reason be judged legally invalid or ineffective under applicable law, then the Waiver shall be preserved to the maximum extent permitted taking into account Affirmer's express Statement of Purpose. In addition, to the extent the Waiver is so judged Affirmer hereby grants to each affected person a royalty-free, non transferable, non sublicensable, non exclusive, irrevocable and unconditional license to exercise Affirmer's Copyright and Related Rights in the Work (i) in all territories worldwide, (ii) for the maximum duration provided by applicable law or treaty (including future time extensions), (iii) in any current or future medium and for any number of copies, and (iv) for any purpose whatsoever, including without limitation commercial, advertising or promotional purposes (the "License"). The License shall be deemed effective as of the date CC0 was applied by Affirmer to the Work. Should any part of the License for any reason be judged legally invalid or ineffective under applicable law, such partial invalidity or ineffectiveness shall not invalidate the remainder of the License, and in such case Affirmer hereby affirms that he or she will not (i) exercise any of his or her remaining Copyright and Related Rights in the Work or (ii) assert any associated claims and causes of action with respect to the Work, in either case contrary to Affirmer's express Statement of Purpose.

4. Limitations and Disclaimers.

- a) No trademark or patent rights held by Affirmer are waived, abandoned, surrendered, licensed or otherwise affected by this document.
- b) Affirmer offers the Work as-is and makes no representations or warranties of any kind concerning the Work, express, implied, statutory or otherwise, including without limitation warranties of title, merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, non infringement, or the absence of latent or other defects, accuracy, or the present or absence of errors, whether or not discoverable, all to the greatest extent permissible under applicable law.
- c) Affirmer disclaims responsibility for clearing rights of other persons that may apply to the Work or any use thereof, including without limitation any person's Copyright and Related Rights in the Work. Further, Affirmer disclaims responsibility for obtaining any necessary consents, permissions or other rights required for any use of the Work.
- d) Affirmer understands and acknowledges that Creative Commons is not a party to this document and has no duty or obligation with respect to this CC0 or use of the Work.